

I did not observe from the reading of this paper any language that was in the slightest degree offensive to the majority of this body. It was pretty much a recapitulation of the arguments which have been used upon this floor by gentlemen upon the several occasions to which it refers. If the protest had contained language which in its nature was offensive to the majority of this body, or otherwise, it would be right and proper that the majority in vindication of their own self-respect, and of their own sense of propriety should exclude it from the journal. But as the reading of it has developed no such language, and it is simply a recapitulation of the arguments which have been used by these gentlemen upon the several topics referred to in that paper, I trust that that majority with which I act will permit the paper to take the proper and ordinary course and go upon the journal.

We have nothing to fear from it. There is nothing in it which in the slightest degree prejudices our position. We have put our views upon the journal, and they go out together. And even if it should be deemed so strong, argumentative and logical a paper as to require a response, it is competent for us also to put upon the journal a paper of a corresponding character. But I do not think it requires any procedure of that kind. It is simply the exercise of a privilege which prevails in every well regulated parliamentary body everywhere. The right is in the body to protect itself from insult, indignity and offence. If any offence is designed to the majority of this body, they will take good care so to protect themselves.

But in this particular instance I trust the majority will not exclude this paper. We have nothing to fear from it. I do not consider that there is any strength, force or power in the arguments there adduced against the action of this body upon the subjects to which they refer. We have nothing to fear from it. I trust, therefore, the minority will be permitted, as a privilege which belongs to them, to put upon the journal whatever they please, provided it be not offensive to the majority of this body. For one I have seen nothing in it which offends me, and nothing in it which I think should offend the most fastidious member of the majority here. Surely there is nothing in it which in the slightest degree impairs the strength of our position upon the subjects referred to therein.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely) can see no offensive language in the document which has been read here, I should like very much to see language which he would call offensive. This paper indulges in a very latitudinous lecture to the majority for their general dereliction of duty, in meddling with matters and things which do not concern them,

and it caps the climax by directly charging upon the majority the inauguration of a military despotism in the State. Yet the gentleman from Baltimore county can see nothing offensive in all this. For my part, I consider it a direct insult to the majority of the house, and altogether unworthy and unfit to go upon the journal.

Mr. CHAMBERS. If the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott) can find one word in this whole protest which is offensive personally or collectively to this body, he is able to discover what its authors have not been able to find. We profess therein certain principles. We say that certain measures will result in certain consequences. Is the gentleman so far disposed to avail himself of the power of the majority of this body as to prevent the minority from expressing their opinions of the consequences of certain acts, of a certain course of action, and to define what they suppose will result as a consequence from the adoption of certain principles? Are we to pass no opinions upon measures? Is the declaration of our belief that certain consequences will necessarily result from the adoption of certain measures, to be deemed personally offensive to members here? Does the dignity of the majority require that the minority should be restrained from showing to the world, especially to their constituents, the result of proposed or adopted measures? Where is the personality in saying that such and such a course of proceeding amounts to a military despotism? Have I not the right to say such is my belief? Is the gentleman offended by my expressing that opinion? Does the gentleman feel in any degree insulted because I think that when you invite the President of the United States or any one of his appointed officers, to come into the State of Maryland, and *ad libitum*, with court or jury, or any other process of law, assess at his sole discretion the amount which one person is to pay, and which another person is to receive; and proceed to administer the law in that respect? I say that in my humble judgment that is equivalent to a military despotism. Does that insult the gentleman from Cecil (Mr. Scott)? Then our mouths are to be hermetically sealed; we are to sit the silent spectators of a proceeding, and not even be permitted to discuss what will probably be the result of the action.

Now I take no exception to any one of the remarks of the gentleman from Baltimore county (Mr. Ridgely.) I think he has taken the true ground. The dignity of the body, and of every member of it should require that nothing should go upon its journal which personally reflects upon its members, or is personally insulting to them as participants in the adoption of these measures. Now is there a word in this paper saying that any one of the majority would knowingly, or willingly, or intentionally introduce a sys-